

# Michigan's Water Strategy

## Economic Regional Roundtable Discussion Summary

### Background

During 2013, the OGL hosted Economic Regional Roundtable Discussions in each of the 10 Michigan Prosperity Regions in collaboration with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, and the Michigan Economic Development Corporation. The purpose of the economic roundtables was to discuss how local and regional economic development efforts currently depend on water and related resources, and to hear and understand how the participants feel these needs and opportunities will evolve in the future. In addition, OGL gathered input on the draft Water Strategy goals, outcomes, and regional and statewide issues. The discussions were held in Marquette, Traverse City, Gaylord, Grand Rapids, Saginaw, Flint, Lansing, Battle Creek, Adrian and Detroit. Please refer to the list of participants at the end of this report.

With the help of local contacts, OGL invited roughly 25 economic and community development leaders actively engaged in water-related projects and issues to each discussion. Attendees reflected perspectives from academia, agriculture, business, industry, economic and community development, tribal nations, conservation, environmental, fishing, hunting, harbors, public health, local units of government, planning, philanthropy, recreation, and tourism.

### Summary of Key Themes

Each economic roundtable was a three-hour discussion focused on economic development and water at the regional scale. Participants provided feedback on the goals and outcomes and brought forward several themes and ideas that should be reflected in the Water Strategy. Below is the summary of these key themes.

**Michigan's available freshwater resources will become increasingly valuable as water resources become scarcer nationally and globally.** Attendees were asked how their region's dependence on water will evolve during the next 30 years. Responses tended to focus on Michigan's abundance of the natural resource and the increasing value of water around the world. Participants felt that Michigan will become a more attractive place to live, work and play because of the availability of fresh water and opportunities for growing business and recreational opportunities. Participants recognized that groundwater recharge, water reuse and monitoring of water resources would become increasingly important in the future.

**Michigan has the opportunity to become a leader in research and development of freshwater technologies.** Participants identified a need for investments in the development of technology focused on protecting and restoring Michigan's water resources

as well as helping address global water issues. They highlighted collaboration among business, industry, government and universities as a way to capitalize on water technology, innovation, research and development. Michigan's leadership in technologies would increase Michigan's economic capacity and would encourage others to look to the state for guidance on water issues.

**Education of leaders and citizens about basic water principles is important to inform wise decision making and drive water-related stewardship.** There was consensus among participants that the public needs to understand how to protect and care for the resource and must have the desire to do so. The public, legislators and youth must be educated about basic water principles and the hydrologic cycle to make educated and wise decisions. Participants recognized the need for storytelling about the evolution of water challenges in Michigan, progress made to address these challenges, and successes to increase stewardship of the resource. More place-based education is needed to build a sense of place, stronger connections to the resource and stewardship of water.

**Public access to water resources** was viewed as an important opportunity for economic development and improving quality of life. Some regions were very concerned that their lack of public access points inhibited economic development. Increased public access was also viewed as a way to connect people to the resource and nurture stewardship.

**Marketing strategies should place a stronger emphasis on water assets and placemaking** to attract talent, economic development and tourism. Participants agreed that marketing efforts could be better utilized on a regional scale to leverage unique assets within the state. Strategies that promote high-quality, water-based job opportunities; high quality of life amenities; and water-based recreational opportunities can attract youth and talented workers.

**Balancing economic growth and environmental protection** was identified as challenge for many regions. Demands for increased agricultural and industrial uses create challenges for protecting water resources. Growing economic capacity is dependent on the ability to maintain infrastructure and the health of our ecosystem.

**Access to clean, affordable drinking water** was important to most regions of the state.

**The importance of the land and water interface needs to be recognized in planning and decision making.** Planning, infrastructure, agriculture and other economic decisions must be made with an understanding of the impact on water resources. Watershed planning, infrastructure investments, and community and economic development planning need to be connected.

**Investment in infrastructure maintenance and management** was repeatedly expressed as a priority to the regions. Most areas had infrastructure that was 50-60 years old and needed more investment in the development of sustainable, green infrastructure.

**Failing septic systems need to be addressed to protect water quality and public health.** Participants were concerned with the public's lack of knowledge about septic system maintenance. Many failing septic systems could be addressed through public education about appropriate maintenance, as well as through local and state regulations such as point-of-sale inspections or the establishment of a statewide sanitary septic code.

**Policies, regulations, investments and resources must be aligned and integrated at all levels to achieve regional and local goals.** Many participants were concerned with how the Strategy aligned with other existing plans, compacts and policies and with how the state would ensure sustainability of the Strategy. The impacts of state policies and regulations on the implementation of community development and economic development plans needs to be better understood at the local level. In some cases, regulations at the regional or state level were noted as a barrier to implementation. Participants emphasized that planning and resolution of issues were best addressed at the local level.

### **Conflicts Around Water**

OGI asked participants to discuss areas of water-related conflict, particularly those occurring in their region. Many participants identified the lack of knowledge or understanding of water issues and the causes of the issue as one source of conflict. Water issues were sometimes extremely complex and participants felt that decisions were sometimes made without a full understanding or adequate information about the problem and its causes. Further, conflict is often caused by a lack of alignment in policies and decision-making among different groups working on related issues. The impact of industry, agriculture and groundwater extraction on the integrity of the water resource was a source of conflict in regions with higher concentrations of industry or groundwater contamination. The responsibility of stormwater management was also a source of conflict in urban areas.

The conversation then focused on conflicts that may arise in the future and common organizations that assist with conflict resolution. Examples of future conflicts included groundwater withdrawals, allocation of funding and resources, and the competing uses of water for agriculture, industry and recreation. Most conflicts, participants thought, originated with a lack of knowledge about the issue and a lack of a consistent and/or accepted conflict-resolution method. Groups mentioned as trusted agents to resolve conflict included Michigan State University Extension, MDEQ and MDNR. While all of the regions varied on their current capacity to resolve conflict locally, most participants agreed

that conflict resolution should lie at the community level. Communities need to develop the capacity to resolve conflict and collaborate at the local level.

### **Collaboration**

OGL also asked participants if they saw any areas of potential collaboration to achieve the proposed goals and outcomes of the Strategy. In almost all of the regions, participants saw DEQ as a facilitator to assist in effective collaboration at the local level. They identified a strong culture of collaboration at the state, regional and community levels as necessary to achieving the Water Strategy's goals and outcomes. The creation and communication of a unifying vision statement in the Strategy would help guide communities. Diverse interest groups should work together using appropriate tools and resources to solve problems. Participants recognized opportunities to be more inclusive at the community level when working to come up with solutions. Furthermore, they recognized the large role agriculture and industry play in water usage without being brought in to the decision-making process.

### **Funding and Resources**

Participants also offered input on how the funding system should be structured to ensure capacity to fund the vital priorities that will be reflected in the Strategy. Financing and resource capacity was noted as critical to the achievement of the water strategy goals and outcomes. Some suggestions for raising funds included a charge for groundwater use, a rain tax or fee, and monetary incentives to encourage local funding. Regions also indicated that funds should come from a mix of public and private entities.

### **Regional Uniqueness**

The economic roundtables were also intended to provide the OGL with an understanding of whether regional needs and opportunities around water were reflected in the draft goals and outcomes of the Strategy. Participants at regional meetings were asked how their region uniquely depends on water currently and in the future. In addition, participants were asked if their region's needs and opportunities around water were reflected in the draft water strategy goals and outcomes. The following sections highlight this regional distinctiveness from the participants' perspectives.

#### **Region 1: Marquette**

Participants highlighted the Upper Peninsula's unique water resources that define the region and play an important role in its economy, including three Great Lakes watersheds, desirable state parks and high quality waters. A key theme expressed by the region was that economic activity has become much more diverse in the last decade. In addition to the developed mining industry, tourism, fishing and paper industries have become increasingly important. About 30 percent of the region's economic base comes from the high abundance of raw materials that are available to these industries.

Upper Peninsula participants expressed the importance of protecting pristine waters to prevent the need for remediation. High water quality and quantity was seen as vital to future economic development. To ensure thoughtful decision-making, they identified education of the public and young people on water and watershed principles as a priority. The group also noted an opportunity to better market the Upper Peninsula's water resources, state parks and other recreational opportunities in order to increase tourism and attract and retain young people.

### **Region 2: Traverse City**

High quality water is extremely important to the Northwest Lower Peninsula because of growing recreational activities like kayaking, boating and swimming. However, this area faces some unique challenges with managing swimmer's itch in inland lakes and concerns about hydraulic fracturing. The region is also uniquely characterized by its strong leadership in planning and community development. Industrial features were purposefully placed in areas that would not be disruptive to the beauty or public use of natural resources.

The group anticipated the need to improve infrastructure management in order to handle the expansion of second homes, extreme weather and changes in water levels. Participants identified opportunities for water reuse and conservation in industrial use through the development of water technologies. Jobs related to this technology development were also seen as an avenue to attract and retain young talent.

### **Region 3: Gaylord**

Northeast Michigan is uniquely characterized by an abundance of cold-water streams and rivers. More specifically, Otsego County is home to five major, pristine, cold-water river systems. Additionally, the group identified the growth of wild rice in inland lakes and commercial fishing on Lake Huron as important aspects of the region's culture. The group identified groundwater contamination and swimmer's itch on inland lakes as important issues of concern.

Tourism is an opportunity for future economic development in the region. Greater marketing of the region's abundant cold waters, shipwrecks, and fishing and boating recreational activities is needed to increase and attract visitors. Increasing local awareness of the value of the surrounding natural resources as well as educating the public and officials on land and water connections was important to participants. In addition, preserving Northeast Michigan's wetlands, high quality surface waters, and the quality and quantity of groundwater for drinking water will be important for future economic development and ecological health in the region.

### **Region 4: Grand Rapids**

Participants saw ample public access to water, the presence of five of the state's largest

rivers, and higher population density as West Michigan's unique characteristics. Region 4 is self-sufficient on conflict management and has a unique culture of collaboration and innovation. Issues unique to West Michigan included: legacy contamination of the Kalamazoo River, which could become the largest superfund site in the U.S.; sewer overflows; impervious surfaces; and storm water management.

The group saw public education on the increasing value of water, water literacy principles, land and water connections, and individual impact on the resources as an important need. Further, they saw creating a culture of consciousness about water stewardship and sustainability as opportunities. The group also mentioned the need to involve a broader audience of diverse interest groups in the region's decision-making process. Another key theme expressed by Region 4 was the opportunity to expand the role of agriculture and industry in order to meet increasing demands for food and water in the future.

### **Region 5: Saginaw**

Participants identified a world-class walleye fishery, a large coastal wetland system and the natural features of Saginaw Bay as characteristics unique to Region 5. However, the group mentioned that use of these resources for recreation is limited due to lack of public access. Saginaw is distinct from other northern Michigan regions because there is major focus on restoration of natural resources. Agribusiness was identified as a major sector in the bay area affecting water quality and use. Other issues identified included population loss, runoff into the bay and aging infrastructure.

There was strong support to expand the bay region's tourism industry through the creation of increased accessibility to the bay, waterfront lodging, a casino, bird trails, and the cleanup of eutrophication and muck issues. The group noted that building a pier would improve visibility of the bay from the ground, and the creation of more boat and kayak launches would allow people to easily reach well-known fishing locations. Changing public perception by telling the story of improvements in water quality as a result of the tremendous amount of work is important. Educating the public was noted as a regional need in order to create stewardship of the resource and to ensure that people focus on solving the right problems.

### **Region 6: Flint**

The Flint group noted the region's longstanding focus on water from its historical dependence on the lumber, fur, automobile, manufacturing and agriculture industries. More recently, the city began to orient the community around the waterfront. Unique recreational characteristics Region 6 highlighted included birding trails, undeveloped and developed beaches, boating, fishing, and hunting. Regionally specific issues include old infrastructure on the water and traffic on the main roads.

Region 6 participants focused on the opportunity to market the area as a weekend vacation destination to recapture dollars locally instead of sending them “up north.” More developed public access points, bird trails and the cleanup of old vacant industrial sites were mentioned as ways to build recreational desirability. Older infrastructure and groundwater contamination were mentioned as regionally specific issues.

### **Region 7: Lansing/Bath**

The Lansing area saw its region as unique because of limited access to either inland lakes or the Great Lakes. This lack of abundant water features has spurred more careful stormwater management and restoration of the region’s limited water resources. Further, the group mentioned that while there are some recreational activities such as swimming, kayaking and golfing; agriculture and industry dominate the region’s water use. Groundwater was important to the region and was expected to grow in importance in the future.

Region 7 wanted to more effectively capitalize on water-related assets and recreational opportunities by improving quality and access to the resource. Partnerships with the universities presented opportunities to lead in the innovative solutions to maintain water in the system and protect groundwater as a source of drinking water. The group highlighted stormwater management and water reuse as major opportunities to retain water. Region 7 also noted that there are opportunities to encourage and expand innovative approaches to drive sustainability through better regulations, voluntary programs and market forces.

### **Region 8: Battle Creek**

A key theme expressed in Southwest Michigan as a unique differentiator for the region is its dependence on agriculture. The region accounts for 70 percent of the state’s irrigation, including more than 300,000 irrigated acres. Seed corn production is the major crop, but the group also mentioned that Berrien County is the second-most diverse agricultural county in the nation because of the soils and climate. Another unique aspect emphasized in Region 8 is waterfront redevelopment opportunities that were previously neglected.

The group saw high agriculture capacity as an opportunity to address growing global food demand. The group also indicated that there is potential to market the region’s recreational opportunities to increase tourism. Southwest Michigan identified the need to address contamination issues first, before removing dams, reconnecting rivers and promoting recreational opportunities. Participants also expressed a desire to improve public perceptions about water quality and educate citizens and public officials on land and water connections to ensure responsible decision-making.

### **Region 9: Adrian**

Region 9’s karst geology was identified as a major influencer of water quality unique from

other parts of Michigan. The group also indicated that the region contains headwaters for many of Michigan's major rivers. Additionally, participants noted that their watershed hosts many acres of agriculture as well as artesian wells in Monroe County and parks. One other distinctive characteristic in Region 9 is a high rate of population growth and conversion of seasonal housing to year-round living.

The group emphasized the importance of addressing algae blooms in Lake Erie because they affect tourism, fisheries and water supplies. Additionally, continuing restoration initiatives like increasing river access was identified as a way to encourage economic development. Other opportunities mentioned included university engagement with water development research, attracting young professionals by reorienting communities around water resources, and increasing recreational opportunities through the development of more canoe and kayak rentals and water trails.

### **Region 10: Detroit**

Unique regional attributes discussed included old infrastructure, an industry-driven economy, a number of universities, a dense population with a higher demand for water, a world-class fishery and a large port. The group also noted that there is limited public access to the water in Detroit and that the riverfront is underutilized. They saw Lake St. Clair's large boating and fishing industries as major recreational components of the region.

Southeast Michigan's universities were identified as having exceptional collaboration around the water sciences, creating an opportunity for the region and the state to become a leader in freshwater technologies. Stormwater and wastewater management were emphasized as potential beneficiaries of such research. Other opportunities for Southeast Michigan expressed by the group included capitalizing on unused capacity in existing infrastructure and increasing access to and marketing of the region's natural water assets for recreational use.

### **Feedback on Goals and Outcomes**

To help attendees understand the Water Strategy's goals and outcomes, regional participants were asked to vote on the draft outcomes, choosing those that most closely reflected their region's priorities around water. Following the voting exercise, each region discussed which outcomes were selected and why. The outcomes were revisited later in the session and participants were asked if, based on the conversation, their region's views and priorities were reflected in the drafted outcomes. Participants were asked what they felt was missing from the drafted list, and were provided an opportunity to propose new outcomes. Please refer to Appendix B to review the goals and outcomes that were shared with the groups.

**Voting and reflection on outcomes.** The following outcomes were selected most often as priorities throughout the regions:



- Drinking water is safe and available
- Water infrastructure is well-designed and maintained to support recreational, economic, and cultural uses and values
- Groundwater is managed for human uses and environmental integrity
- Leaders at all levels support investment of both public and private funding in Michigan's water resources, reflecting individuals' value of a connection between a healthy environment, strong economy, and high quality of life

The following outcomes were selected least often as a regional priority:

- Great Lakes and inland beaches are safe for swimming
- Coastal and shoreline areas and infrastructure are compatible with ecological function and human use
- Aquatic life is managed for the resilience of aquatic ecosystem function and diversity
- Management practices recognize the land-water and hydrologic connections

Generally, participants commented that the outcomes selected least often had a more narrow focus than the ones that were most often selected. Additionally, prevention of invasive species, management through the utilization of a watershed approach and better conservation of water were issues that several participants wanted to see explicitly expressed in the outcomes. Newly proposed outcomes that received the most votes focused on funding and stewardship of the resource.

Overall, each of the regions noted that their main views and priorities were reflected in the goals and outcomes. The gaps or missing themes identified by participants were generally issues or threats to water resources, such as climate change and invasive species management, and are more programmatic or tactical, given that they illustrate the way in which to get to a desired state or condition.

## List of Roundtable Attendees

### ***Economic Development Region 1***

**September 17, 2013 - Marquette**

#### **Northern Michigan University**

Carl Lindquist, Superior Watershed Partnership

Ron Sundell, Northern Michigan University

James Cantrill, Northern Michigan University

Caralee Swanberg, Lake Superior Community Partnership

Gary LaPlant, Community Foundation of the Upper Peninsula

Karl Zueger, City of Marquette

Dr. David Watkins, Michigan Technological University

Ally Dale, Marquette County Conservation District

Jon Fosgitt, Compass Land Consultants

Dave Anderson, Copperwood Project

Phil Musser, Keweenaw Economic Development Alliance

Scott Gischia, Cleveland Cliffs

Curt Goodman, City of Marquette

Brent Ketzenberger, Cleveland Cliffs

Stacy Welling Haughey, MDNR

Steve Casey, MDEQ

JR Richardson, Traxys Power

### ***Economic Development Region 2***

**September 25, 2013 - Traverse City**

#### **Northwest Michigan Works!**

Megan Olds, Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy

Scott Gest, Northwest Michigan Council of Governments

John Sych, Grand Traverse County

Joseph H. Elliott, Grand Traverse Conservation District

Kevin McElyea, Grand Traverse County Drain Commissioner

Cindy Ruzack, Rotary Charities of Traverse City

Sarah U'Ren, Watershed Center Grand Traverse Bay

Amy Beyer, Conservation Resource Alliance

Treenen Sturman, Grand Traverse Conservation District

Tad Peacock, Benzie Conservation District

Hans VanSumeren, Northwestern Michigan College

Mark Breederland, Michigan Sea Grant

Trudy Galla, Leelanau County Planning

Dan Vogler, Michigan Aquaculture Association

Chuck May, Great Lakes Small Harbor Coalition

Greg Goudy, MDEQ

Brian Jankowski, MDEQ

Steve Hammon, Traverse City Golf and Country Club

Jim MacInnes, Owner of Crystal Mountain

Emily Myerson, Top of Michigan Trails Council

Jason Jones, Grand Traverse County Parks and Recreation

Don Coe, Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development Commission

Tino Breithaupt, MEDC

### ***Economic Development Region 3***

**September 24, 2013 - Gaylord**

#### **University Center**

Curtis Chambers, Cheboygan County

Brad Jensen, Huron Pines

Lisha Ramsdell, Huron Pines

Jeff Ratcliffe, Otsego County Economic Alliance

John Walters, Pigeon River Country Advisory Council

Wayne R. Jonker, Kalkaska County Drain Commissioner

Dana Bensinger, Otsego County Community Foundation

Rick Harland, Grayling Charter Township

Craig Cotterman, Denton Township Supervisor

Vicki Springstead, Higgins Lake Foundation

Anne Meeks, Higgins Lake Foundation

Mark Copeland, Jay's Sporting Goods

Dawn Bodnar, Indian River Chamber of Commerce

Grenetta Thommasey, Tip of the Mitt Watershed Council

Robert Dixon, Grayling Township

Dave Waltz, Au Sable River Watershed  
Restoration Committee  
Richard Deuell, Northeast Michigan Council of  
Governments  
Lydia Murray, MEDC  
Jeff Gray, Thunder Bay Marine Sanctuary

***Economic Development Region 4***  
**November 25, 2013 – Grand Rapids**  
**DeVos Place**

Mark Knudsen, Ottawa County Planner  
April Scholtz, West Michigan Land  
Conservancy  
Bill Byl, Kent County Drain Commission  
Brad Boomstra, Kent County Drain  
Commission  
Felicia Fairchild, Saugatuck and Douglas  
Convention and Visitors Bureau  
David Rinard, Steelcase  
Gabe Wing, Herman Miller  
Kevin Larsen, H2Opportunities  
Bob Kennedy, Commission Chair  
Jonathon Jarosz, Heart of the Lakes  
Gail Heffner, Calvin College/Plaster Creek  
Stewards  
Nichol Demol, Trout Unlimited  
Rick Chapla, The Right Place  
Ed Garner, Muskegon Area First  
Michelle Skedgell, Pierce Cedar Creek  
Institute  
Dr. Hugh Brown, Pierce Cedar Creek  
Institute  
Bonnie Hildreth, Barry Community  
Foundation  
Patty Birkholz, League of Conservation  
Voters  
Andy Guy, Governor Rick Snyder's Office of  
Urban Initiatives  
Jan Urban Lurain, Spectra Data and  
Research  
Jason Ball, Kuntzsch Business Services  
Travis Williams, Outdoor Discovery Center  
Macatawa Greenway  
Mike Wenkel, Potato Growers of Michigan  
Inc  
Kara Wood, City of Grand Rapids

Rachel Hood, West Michigan Environmental  
Action Council  
Vicki Luthy, Muskegon Public Health  
Department

***Economic Development Region 5***  
**October 3, 2013 – Saginaw**

**Saginaw Valley State University**  
Michael Kelly, Saginaw Bay Watershed  
Initiative Network  
Dane Cramer, Ducks Unlimited  
Carl Osentoski, Huron County Economic  
Development Corporation  
Kimberly Mason, City of Saginaw  
Trevor Edmonds, Saginaw Basin Land  
Conservancy  
Dennis Zimmerman, Saginaw Bay Area of  
Concern  
Zachary Branigan, Saginaw Basin Land  
Conservancy  
Russ Beaubien, Spicer Group  
David Karpovich, Saginaw Valley State  
University, Saginaw Bay Environmental  
Science Institute  
Shirley Roberts, BaySail  
Jane Fitzpatrick, East Michigan Council of  
Governments  
Paul Strpko, Fisher Companies  
Ray VanDriessche, Michigan Sugar Company  
Tim Boring, Michigan State University  
Extension  
Laura Ogar, Bay County Environmental  
Affairs and Community Development  
Patti Stowell, Bay City Economic  
Development Corporation  
Dr. Donald Uzarski, Institute for Great Lakes  
Research  
Julie Spencer, Gratiot Conservation District  
Administrator  
Trevor Keyes, Bay Future  
Sheila Stamris, City of Frankenmuth  
Downtown Development Authority  
Carey Pauquette, Saginaw Chippewa Indian  
Tribe  
Michael Fisher, Saginaw Chippewa Indian  
Tribe  
Peter W. Little, Gratiot County Parks and  
Recreation

Harry Leaver, Saginaw Valley State  
University, Center for Business & Economic  
Development  
Bob Zeilinger, Cass River Greenways  
Committee  
Joel Strasz, Bay County Health Department  
Joseph Rivet, Bay County Drain Commissioner  
Donald Schurr, Greater Gratiot Development  
Scott Walker, Midland Tomorrow  
Jennifer Humphries, MDARD

### ***Economic Development Region 6***

**October 11, 2013 – Flint**

#### **Flint and Genesee Chamber of Commerce**

Joe Stock, Lapeer County  
Chris Bunch, Six Rivers Land Conservancy  
Randy Maiers, St. Clair Community  
Foundation  
Janice Karcher, Genesee Regional Chamber of  
Commerce  
Doug Weiland, Genesee County Land Bank  
Authority  
Mark Brochu, St. Clair County Parks &  
Recreation  
Lori Eschenburg, Metropolitan Planning  
Commission  
Jumana Vasi, Charles Stewart Mott  
Foundation  
Mary Bohling, Michigan Sea Grant  
Jason Hami, City of Marysville  
Daugherty Johnson, City of Flint  
Greg Alexander, Sanilac County Drain  
Commissioner  
Janet VandeWinkle, Flint River Corridor  
Alliance  
Jason Caya, Flint Area Reinvestment Office  
Nadine Thor, Kettering University  
Rafael Turner, Flint and Genesee Chamber of  
Commerce  
Derek Bradshaw, Genesee County  
Metropolitan Planning  
Danielle Lewinski, Center for Community  
Progress (Flint)  
Tom Raymond, Lexington Village Manager  
Rebecca Fedewa, Flint River Watershed  
Coalition  
Steve Trecha, Integrated Strategies  
Justin Sprague, Genesee Chamber of  
Commerce

Sheri Faust, Friends of the St. Clair River and  
Health Department  
Marci Fogal, Blue Water Area Convention and  
Visitors Bureau  
Jack Stock, Kettering University  
Michael Freeman, Flint River Corridor  
Alliance  
Amy McMillan, Genesee County Parks and  
Recreation  
Justin Horvath, Shiawassee Economic  
Development Partnership

### ***Economic Development Region 7***

**October 25, 2013 – Lansing**

#### **Bengel Wildlife Conservancy**

Eric Pessel, Barry-Eaton Health Department  
Liesl Eichler Clark, 5 Lakes Energy  
James Byrum, Michigan Agri-Business  
Association  
Michelle Napier-Dunning, Michigan Food &  
Farming Systems  
Doug Buhler, Michigan State University,  
Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station  
Sandy Gower, Ingham County Economic  
Development Corporation  
Brad Garmon, Michigan Environmental  
Council  
Brian Burroughs, Trout Unlimited  
Laura Campbell, Michigan Farm Bureau  
John Warbach, Michigan State University  
Land Policy Institute  
Phil Hanes, Clinton County Drain  
Commission  
Joseph Mion, Golder Associates  
Phil Korson, Michigan Cherry Committee  
Meghan Swain, Michigan Association for  
Local Public Health  
Bill Maier, Board of Water and Light  
Garrett Johnson, Michigan Nature Association  
Tim Boring, Michigan Soybean Association  
Regina Young, Barry-Eaton Health  
Department  
Jim Zook, Corn Marketing Program of  
Michigan  
James Byrum, Michigan Agri-Business  
Association  
Abigail Walls, Michigan Forest Products  
Council

***Economic Development Region 8***

**October 7, 2013 – Battle Creek**

**W. K. Kellogg Foundation**

Tracy Bronson, Calhoun Conservation District  
Ken Masumoto, Ken Masumoto Resources  
Peter Terlouw, Southwest Michigan Land Conservancy  
Dawn Dye, Calhoun County Visitors Bureau  
Michael McCuiston, Edward Lowe Foundation  
Robert Whitesides, Kalamazoo River Watershed Council  
Robert Mason, Post Foods  
Angela Myers, Battle Creek Community Foundation  
Marcy Colclough, Southwest Michigan Planning Commission  
Christine Hilton, City of Battle Creek Planning & Community Development  
Ken Kohs, City of Battle Creek - Utilities Director  
Lyndon Kelley, Michigan State University Extension  
Joan Bowman, Global Food Protection Institute  
Kelly Clarke, Kalamazoo County Land Bank Authority  
John Gruchot, Berrien County

***Economic Development Region 9***

**November 6, 2013 – Adrian**

**Lenawee Now**

Dan Stefanski, River Raisin Area of Concern  
Charles Londo, City of Luna Pier  
Amy Torres, Jackson County Enterprise Group  
Evan Pratt, Washtenaw County Water Resources Commissioner  
Brian Jonckheere, Livingston County Water Resources Commissioner  
Pamela McConeghy, Brighton Greater Chamber  
Grant Bauman, Region 2 Planning Commission  
Susan Smith, Economic Development Partnership of Hillsdale County  
Christine Bowman, Hillsdale County Chamber of Commerce  
Christie Cook, Community Action Agency

Shelby Bollwahn, Michigan State University Extension

Tim Lake, Monroe County Business Development Corporation  
Ned Birkey, County of Monroe  
Christopher Miller, City of Adrian  
Martin Marshall, Lenawee County  
James Van Doren, Lenawee Now  
Jim Frey, Resource Recycling Systems  
Richard Micka, River Raisin Public Advisory Council  
Rich Weirich, Frenchtown Township  
Tom Tarleton, Michigan Economic Development Corporation  
Paula Holtz, City of Tecumseh  
Keith McCormack, Hubbell, Roth, and Clark

***Economic Development Region 10***

**October 21, 2013 – Detroit**

**SEMCOG**

Tom Doran, Engineering Society of Detroit  
Malik Goodwin, Detroit Economic Growth Corporation  
Rebecca Witt, Greening of Detroit  
Anne Vaara, Clinton River Watershed Council  
Laura Rubin, Huron River Watershed Council  
Gerard Santoro, Macomb County Planning  
Tom Woidwode, Southeast Michigan Community Foundation  
Jim Ridgway, Alliance of Rouge Communities  
Bob Burns, Friends of the Detroit River  
Lynne Seymour, Macomb County Public Works  
Tim O'Brien, Sustainable Water Works  
Joe Depinto, LimnoTech  
Brian Tingley, City of Mount Clemens  
Merrie Carlock, City of Southfield  
Brandy Bakita Siedlaczek, City of Southfield  
Michelle Selzer, DEQ  
Heidi McKenzie, Ford Motor Company  
Jim Wagner, City of Trenton  
John Cole, Director of Mechanical Engineering, Albert Kahn Building  
Erma Leaphart-Gouch, Sierra Club  
Jay Richardson, Sustainable Water Works  
Chris Dorle, Detroit Future City  
Jim Nash, Oakland County Water Resources Commissioner

Sue F. McCormick, Detroit Water and  
Sewerage Department  
Jamie Shea, Mission Throttle